

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Our main concerns is privacy and the close proximity the build will be to our motability vehicle, our only entrance to our property and the safety of our two dogs that are constantly in and out of house throughout the day. I will also add our previous comments too. Finally i'd like to add that the owners of 53 Penhurst have been forthcoming and polite and have said they are aware of our concerns and will help whenever they can during the build.	See section 7 .

Previous comments...After receiving details of the proposal to plan a two storey extension i would like to object. We rent the property Scratchface Lane from Radian. The property was adapted by Radian to help my wife.The vehicle is kept on an internal driveway that's connected to the garage that will be demolished to build the planned extension. Radian also built a double security gate that is also connected to the garage. The only access we have is via these gates. These doors are only a few metres away from the garage too. We also have two dogs that use our garden throughout the day and we need the property secure for this purpose too. The garden fence is also connected to the garage and will be removed too, this is obviously yet another security issue for us. Finally because of our close proximity to the planned demolition we object because of the total disruption and not to mention dust and debris that will obviously cover our vehicle. We obviously need it parked where it is .	See Section 7 . This is a civil matter which would need to be resolved by the applicants and their neighbours . This is a civil matter which would need to be resolved by the applicants and their neighbours.

7 **Planning Considerations**

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

- 7.3 This application comprises of the demolition of the garage , with a two storey side extension incorporating a hip to gable roof and loft extension with two pitched dormers to the front and one flat roof dormer to the rear. The side extension would have a width of 1.8 metres, extending the depth of the property, with a distance of 0.7 metres left towards the Northern boundary. The rear dormer would extend across both the existing and new roof of the property to a width of 6.3 metres , a depth of 3.4 metres and a height of 2.3 metres. The dormers to the front of the property would each be approximately 1.7 metres width by 1.7 metres height and 2.5 metres depth. This application is a revised application following the submission of a previous application referenced APP/19/00847 which was refused in October 2019 . Amendments include a partial hip to the roof and the reduction to the rear dormer by approximately 0.7 metres.
- 7.4 The previous reasons for refusal included potential overbearing impact upon the neighbouring bungalows to the North which are situated at a lower level to the application site. The case Officer advised that possible solutions to this may be to hip the roof and reduce the front and rear dormers. The current application has gone some way to address this however it is not considered the changes are substantial enough to mitigate against the issues of overbearingness and overdevelopment. The partial hip as proposed would not bring the roof away from the bungalows to the North adequately to reduce the dominating impact. The dormers to the front elevation haven't been reduced in number and the dormer to the rear still remains a substantial structure on the roof slope.
- 7.5 It is considered that the current proposal does not mitigate against the previous grounds for refusal to warrant a change in decision. The proposal to extend the property with a two- storey side addition together with the rear and front dormers would significantly increase the overall bulk of number 53 and this would be highly overbearing to the occupiers of 85 and 87 Scratchface Lane . As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on these neighbouring properties which is contrary to advice laid out in policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted HBC Borough Design Guide 2011.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

Impact on 85 Scratchface Lane

- 7.6 This property is a bungalow and lies to the North of the application site at a lower level, with the rear boundary adjacent to the application sites northern boundary. The proposed extension would replace the existing garage with a 1.8 metre wide two storey extension with a gable end to a height of 1.8 metres, hipped in at the corner, with a distance of 0.7 metres between the northern elevation of the property and the shared boundary.
- 7.7 The extension runs along the majority of the rear boundary of this property and the resulting outlook from the rear elevation of this property would be of the side elevation which is predominantly brickwork, although there are two small windows serving the landing. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD requires a minimum 10 metre separation distance between a dwelling facing a blank wall and the proposed extension does not meet this requirement.
- 7.8 It is judged that the proposal would not increase the level of overlooking to this property.

- 7.9 It is considered that the proposal would significantly increase the overall bulk of number 53 Penhurst Road and this would be highly overbearing to the occupier of no 85, particularly when using the rear amenity space. As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on this property which is contrary to the advice laid out in policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Havant Borough Council Design Guide.

Impact on 87 Scratchface Lane

- 7.10 This property is a bungalow and lies to the north of the application site at a lower level, with the rear boundary running along the western part of the application sites northern boundary. The proposed extension would replace the existing garage with a 1.8 metre wide two storey extension with a gable end to a height of 8.1 metres, together with front and rear dormers with a distance of 0.7 metres between the northern elevation of the property and the shared boundary.
- 7.11 Regarding potential increase in overlooking, the windows in the first floor and dormer closest to this property are to serve bathrooms. In addition a dormer of a substantial size could be built under permitted development and it is therefore deemed any increase the level of overlooking to this property, would not constitute a defensible reason for refusal.
- 7.12 However, it is considered that the proposal would significantly increase the overall bulk of number 53 Penhurst Road and that this would be highly overbearing to the occupier of this property, particularly when using the rear amenity space. As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on this property which is contrary to the advice laid out in policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Havant Borough Council Design Guide.

Impact on 51 Penhurst Road

- 7.13 This property adjoins the application site to the south. The two storey side extension element of the scheme is to the north of the property and does not extend beyond the existing front or rear elevations of number 53. Whilst the new rear dormer could increase the level of overlooking to this property, a degree of overlooking already exists from the rear first floor windows and in isolation a rear dormer could be built under permitted development. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

Impact on 30 Springfield Close

- 7.14 This property is to the rear (west) of the application site and the rear dormer could be perceived to increase the level of overlooking. Whilst it is acknowledged this property is a bungalow, the proposal does not extend beyond the original rear elevation of the property and the back to back distance from this property and the application site meets the 24 metre distance recommended in the Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD. Furthermore, a degree of overlooking already exists from the rear first floor windows and in isolation a rear dormer could be built under permitted development. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

Impact on 89 Scratchface Lane

- 7.15 Part of the southern boundary of the end of the garden of this property is adjacent to the western end of the side boundary of the application site. The proposal is approximately 13 metres from this boundary with the rear elevation of this property 14 metres away. Whilst the new dormer could increase the level of overlooking to this property, the window of the dormer serving the bedroom is situated towards the southern part. Furthermore, in isolation a rear dormer could be built under permitted development. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

Impact on 83 Scratchface Lane

- 7.16 This property is to the north east of the application site. The proposed extension does not project beyond the existing front elevation of the property and the closest elevation of this property is in excess of 25 metres away. It is therefore deemed any impact would be negligible.

Impact on 58 Scratchface Lane

- 7.17 This property is opposite the application site and the proposed extension does not project beyond the existing front elevation of the property. A distance of approximately 23 metres would be retained between the front elevation of this property and the front elevation of the application site. It is therefore deemed any impact would be negligible.

(iv) Parking

- 7.18 There is an increase in the number of bedrooms from three to four, subsequently there will be a requirement for three on site parking spaces as recommended in the HBC Parking SPD (July 2016). A parking plan has been submitted as part of the application to reflect this.

- 7.5 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed two storey side extension together with the and front dormers, is considered excessively large and it would result in an overbearing presence on the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at 85 and 87 Scratchface Lane. As such, the application is contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011 and is therefore recommended for refusal.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00104 for the following reason

- 1 The proposed extension and dormers would by reason of their height, mass, bulk, design and proximity to the boundary result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring properties at No's 85 and 87 Scratchface Lane, harmful to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.